

Federal District Court  
District of New Hampshire

Kevin Hokenstrom, petitioner

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF N.H.  
 FIELDS

Case # 1-14-fp-557

N.H. Dept. of Corrections, respondent

2014 DEC 15 P 12:10

Petition for  
42 USCS § 1983

Now comes petitioner Kevin Hokenstrom, pro se, an inmate at the N.H. Department of Corrections in Berlin, serving a 22 year sentence that began February 2001. Petitioner respectfully submits to this honorable Court evidence of violations to his civil and Constitutional Rights by the N.H. DOC. These violations include; the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, the Fourteenth Amendment right to due process and 42 USCS § 12101 et. seq. the Americans With Disabilities Act. These violations began in 2001 and have continued through 2014. Petitioner seeks restitution for lost wages, expenses incurred, court costs and punitive damages.

## Table of Contents:

- Responsibility p. 3
- Disabilities described p. 3
- Scope p. 4
- Argument p. 6
- Appendices:
  - Appendix A1-A3 Recommendations by health care and prosthetic professionals.
  - Appendix B1-B3 Chronological listing of footwear and prosthesis delays.
  - Appendix C1-C3 Chronological bullet-form synopsis of Appendix D communications.
  - Appendix D1-D55 Inmate Request Slips (IRS) to DOC staff from 2003 - 2014/

## Responsibility:

Petitioner holds responsible for the hereafter described civil rights violations, the following DOC personnel, both past and present, in their personal and official capacities:

- the Office of the Commissioner William Wrenn (present),
- the Director of Medical and Forensic Services Robert MacLeod (past), Helen Hanks (present)
- Berlin Medical Services Coordinator Denise Raucourt (past), Ryan Landry (present)
- DOC Physical Therapist Bernie Campbell

## Disabilities description:

Petitioner is a 58 year old male with multiple congenital defects from the anomalous development of the skeletal system in utero. The birth defects include missing his left hand and having an extremely short right leg. The bone of the right leg is approximately 8 inches long starting at the hip and attaching directly to the ankle of the foot. The right foot is normal in appearance, but only two-thirds the size of the left foot.

Petitioner's pelvis is deformed with the right hip being  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches lower than the left and that lower right hip (ball and socket) being only  $\frac{2}{3}$  the size of the left hip. There is also a deformation of petitioner's left foot where the front half curves to the right, rendering the foot extremely wide. In 2007 a neuroma was diagnosed in the second IM space of the left foot. As petitioner is missing an extremity on opposite sides of his body, he is classified as severely disabled under Federal guidelines.

### Scope:

Petitioner will present evidence of multiple rights violations by the DOC to include:

- 1) the refusal to provide petitioner the use of his above-knee prosthetic leg for the first 26 months of his incarceration.
- 2) the cruel and unusual punishment inflicted through their deliberate indifference to petitioner's pain and suffering experienced by having to walk daily on an ill fitting and/or broken prosthetic leg for weeks to months at a time. This occurred multiple times over the last 10 years.

3) the DOC's deliberate indifference to petitioner's pain and suffering occurring from weeks of physical rehabilitation resulting from extended periods of time (weeks/months) without the use of the prosthetic leg when it required servicing. This occurred multiple times over the last 10 years.

4) the DOC's discriminatory decision to cease providing shoes necessitated by petitioner's disabilities. From August 2004 until August 2013 the DOC provided the shoes required to meet those needs. However, in September 2013 the DOC reversed their position, telling petitioner to buy his own shoes.

5) the DOC's deliberate indifference as to whether petitioner had use of his prostheses or not, for extended periods of time, has resulted in discrimination by being excluded from:

a) participation in activities available to non-disabled inmates in the outdoor yard and indoor gymnasium.

b) consideration for hiring for several coveted inmate job opportunities.

c) having the choice of living in the more

desirable top floor living units in the facility.

### Argument:

Petitioner respectfully submits this 42 USC §1983 to this honorable Court for remedy and/or restitution from the deprivation of his civil rights and privileges secured by the Constitution and Federal laws violated under the color of the laws, policies and practices of the State of N.H.

Petitioner asserts that personnel of the N.H. Department of Corrections (DOC) have routinely violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, the Fourteenth Amendment to due process, as well as 42 USC §12101 et seq. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The violations began at the start of his incarceration with the DOC refusing him the use of his prosthetic leg for over 2 years, then when petitioner finally got his leg and servicing of any kind was needed, he was without the leg for weeks to months

at a time. These extended and unnecessary periods of time to service and return his leg have been occurring regularly for the last 10 years, reflecting a pattern of deliberate indifference as to whether petitioner had use of his prosthetic leg or not, as well as the pain and suffering resulting from these deprivations.

This apathy has been compounded by new restrictions imposed by policies and procedures focusing only on cost savings and on convenience. In the 30 years preceeding his incarceration, petitioner was only without his prosthetic leg once, for 2 days. All servicing issues were done in minutes to a couple hours with an appointment made within a few days of calling the prosthetic provider.

The ADA § 12102 has defined the word "disability" to mean: "a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of an individual." These major life activities as they apply to petitioner are; caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, walking, standing, lifting, bending and working. For example, when Med. Services



deprives him of his prosthetic leg for weeks to months at a time, even simple life activities become difficult, painful or impossible on crutches with one hand; standing for 30 minutes in the canteen line (prison store), then carrying a bulky bag of purchases back to the unit; filling a mop bucket and cleaning the cell; carrying multiple books to and from the library; participating in any outdoor/indoor recreational activities; etc. While some fellow inmates may be helpful at times, the basic tenet in prison is that nothing comes free.

Then there are the serious disruptions to the major life activities of working and exercising to maintain health. While Mr. Pettitier, who runs the Berlin kitchen has an exemplary record of giving disabled inmates a chance to work and has been very patient in holding petitioner's job twice for several weeks, can't hold a job open for months. Med. Services latest debacle resulted in 5 months without his prostheses, costing him his job. Even though petitioner was hired back a few weeks after receipt of the prosthesis, there is still the issue of lost wages.



The ongoing pattern of extended time without his prosthesis has resulted in inevitable forms of discrimination, in that:

1) petitioner is not eligible for consideration for coveted job positions he would otherwise be qualified for, such as the higher paying 7 day per week positions of cook, lead line worker, etc. These are critical need jobs that can't be filled by someone frequently out for weeks/months at a time. Therefore, petitioner is only able to work in group environments (dish crew, cleaning crew) where others on the crew can cover his absence.

2) Without his prosthesis and reliant on crutches, petitioner is not allowed to live in the preferred top floor housing units of the facility. Fire codes prohibit the use of an elevator as the only safe egress from the living units.

In addition to the apathy regarding his prosthesis, the DOC is discriminating against petitioner by not providing him footwear to meet the needs of his disabilities. Petitioner is unable to wear the boots issued to all other inmates for the following reasons:

1) the prosthesis geometry was designed

for use with sneakers as the bottom of the shoe needs to be flat, i.e.: no raised heel that would snag on any irregularities of the ground when the leg swings forward. The shoes must also be lightweight, as they are swinging at the end of a prosthesis weighing 10 pounds.

Appendix A1 shows the recommendation of such a shoe by the prosthetic provider New England Brace (NEBCO)

2) The deformity of petitioner's left foot requires a shoe width of 4E. The State issued boots are only a D width. The DOC's contracted podiatrist Dr. Bedard-Ryan made the 4E width orthotic insert to provide correct arch support to relieve a painful neuroma. She has instructed petitioner to wear shoes at least 4E in width. The DOC in-house physician Dr. Englander also expressly recommends 4E width flat-sole sneaker shoes. See Appendix A2.

In an 10 month battle petitioner compelled the DOC to meet their obligations to provide the shoes he needed from 2004 to 2012. However, in 2013 they reversed their decision telling petitioner to buy his own shoes.

As the shoes are necessary to accommodate petitioner's disabilities, it is discriminatory to tell him to buy his own shoes while issuing shoes to non-disabled inmates.

The DOC's decision reversal is due to their changing of the Policy and Procedure Directives (PPD) to save money by shedding the obligation to provide footwear necessitated by inmates with disabilities. When the DOC began purchasing petitioner's footwear in 2004, it was only after a 10 month long battle where he asserted his right based on Med. Services PPD 6.16 "Special Shoes/Boots:

The DOC will not pay for footwear except in the following cases: severe foot deformities causing documentable problems regarding pain and function."

As documented in Appendix D3-D14 petitioner made multiple requests for footwear necessary to safely walk with his prosthesis. Physical Therapist Bernie Campbell, Nurse Coordinator Denise Rancourt and Dir. Med. Services Robert MacLeod all made groundless denials to his requests. Petitioner was even told in June 2004 by P.T. Campbell that Dir. MacLeod would stop him from receiving his leg unless

he bought his own shoes. When petitioner wrote to Dir. MacLeod on June 23, 2004 (Appendix D10) asking him to confirm P.T. Campbell's assertions, the Director evaded the question, but did authorize purchase of the shoes. Petitioner was never able to determine whether P.T. Campbell or Dir. MacLeod was the source of the extortion attempt. However, when petitioner wrote to Med. Services that July to confirm the shoe purchase, Nurse Coordinator Denise Rancourt refused the purchase. The final re-approval by Dir. MacLeod didn't occur until August 2004. Med. Services provided the shoes until 2012.

In December 2013 petitioner wrote to the new Director Medical Services Helen Hanks explaining that the shoes are necessary for safe ambulation with his prosthetic leg and preventing severe pain from the left foot neuroma. A Dr. Fedder replied saying that while they are medically recommended, they are not medically necessary. He is telling petitioner he does not have a right to walk.

The reason the DOC believed they could now justify denying petitioner the shoes he needs is that they had recently eliminated

the "Special Shoes/Boots" section from the Med. Services PPD. Petitioner asserts this is a direct violation of the ADA §12182(b)(2)(A)(i) - "the imposition... of eligibility criteria. (ii) a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures. (iii) a failure to take such steps as necessary." The DOC is not simply failing to make modifications to accommodate disabled inmates, they are actively modifying policies & procedures in order to avoid having to make accommodations.

The DOC similarly rewrote the Med. Services PPD regarding replacement of prosthetic devices. In 2004 the Medical PPD stated that the DOC would only replace prosthetic devices with what the inmate came in with. The DOC rewrote this PPD around 2010 to read: "Practitioners will approve the least costly prosthetic device that will accomplish restoration of the basic function determined to be necessary."

A prosthesis manufactured under these guidelines would be substantially heavier and lack knee control functions for safe ambulation. Such a prosthesis would greatly restrict the duration and type of activity available to a disabled

inmate.

This kind of cost justified discrimination is rejected by the Eleventh Circuit in *Zimring v Olmstead* 138 F.3d 893 when the Court stated:

"The ADA §12101 et seq. does not permit the State to justify its discriminatory treatment of individuals with disabilities on the grounds that providing non-discriminatory treatment will require additional expenditures of State funds."

Similarly, the Eleventh Circuit also determined in *Harris v Thigpen* 941 F.2d 1945 that: "The fact that the care may be expensive does not exclude prison officials from providing it."

In 2008 petitioner's 14 year old prosthesis required replacement. Since the obsolete exo-skeletal design was causing problems with petitioner's aging hip due to its inherent excessive weight and since lighter endoskeletal designs had been standard technology for 10 years, the DOC's Dr. Eppolito wrote a prescription for manufacture of an endoskeletal prosthesis with the same knee stability features as his obsolete prosthesis. See Appendix A3. At the initial NEBCO consult, the prosthetist, John Emery, agreed with Dr. Eppolito's recommendation,



particularly since the exoskeletal Mauch knee unit was going out of production soon. However, the DOC ignored the recommendations of both professionals and ordered another obsolete exoskeletal prosthesis manufactured. The few dollars the DOC saved resulted in a significant restriction of petitioners daily walking exercise for the next 5 years due to the hip pain caused by a needlessly heavy prosthesis.

To provide grounds for an ADA claim the First Circuit has established a 3-prong test to be met as stated in *Race v Toledo-Davila* 291 F.3d 857: "To succeed with a claim under Title II of the ADA, a plaintiff must establish; 1) He is a qualified individual with a disability, 2) he was either excluded from participation in or denied the benefits of some public entities' services, programs or activities or was otherwise discriminated against, and 3) that such exclusion, denial of benefits or discrimination was by reason of the plaintiff's disabilities." Petitioner believes he has amply met the Court's requirements for the ADA part of his claim.

Petitioner next asserts that Med. Services' apathy or deliberate indifference to timely



servicing of his prosthesis is considered cruel and unusual punishment as the delays directly cause repeated pain and suffering. The prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment as guaranteed by the Constitution's Eighth Amendment, applies to the State through the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Petitioner contends that the DOC's repeated refusal to expedite the process involved in servicing his prosthesis is an Eighth Amendment violation. This cruel and unusual punishment is manifested in 2 ways:

a) the pain and suffering of having to "hobble around" on a dysfunctioning or ill-fitting prosthesis for weeks to months. The most frequent servicing needed, every 18 months or so, involves removing the Mauch hydraulic knee unit and shipping it out for rebuilding. What petitioner can do on the street with one phone call and 2-3 days later a 2 hour appointment takes months for the DOC to accomplish. The following outlines the best case scenario to have the knee unit rebuilt.

Petitioner sends an IRS to Med. Services when he begins to feel the prosthesis acting erratically, asking for an appointment with provider to

have unit rebuilt. It takes 1-2 weeks for Med. Services to make an appointment. Petitioner is then transported to provider 3-4 weeks later. The knee unit has failed by now, rendering the knee locked-up. This means the leg no longer bends, but there is about  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch of slack, resulting in a jolting gait that sends a sharp vibration to the hip with each step. Next, at the provider's appointment, the prosthetist must examine the prosthesis and then send an estimate for repairs back to the DOC for approval. This approval takes 2-4 weeks, after which another appointment is made and 3-4 weeks later the prosthesis is left with the provider to swap-out a "loaner" hydraulic unit for use while his is being rebuilt. The prosthesis is then returned to Med. Services in 1-2 weeks.

This best case scenario highlights that petitioner is hobbling around on a painfully dysfunctioning prosthesis for a couple of months, then without the prosthesis for at least 1-2 weeks. However, in both 2009 and 2011 petitioner was forced to hobble around for 5 months each time before the unit was rebuilt. By the end of each day,

just doing necessary walking, petitioner's hip hurt so badly the pain continually disrupted his sleep all night.

b) the second manner in which pain and suffering is inflicted on petitioner is after extended periods of time without his prosthesis. As petitioner is 58 years old he has found that his body undergoes alarmingly rapid changes when deprived of his prosthesis for a month or longer. All the muscles involved with walking or bending deteriorate quickly. All of the callouses and toughened skin areas clamped into the socket soften and disappear. This means that every time he is deprived of his leg for a month or more he has to experience the painful rehabilitation of rebuilding severely weakened muscles in the entire lower half of his body and suffer the abrasions, blistering and desensitizing pressure points to recondition the limb to the socket. Less painful but still humiliating are the falls that occur while muscles and balance are gradually regained. It takes about 6 weeks to rebuild muscles and transform the socketed limb to a state of normalcy. Appendix D documents the delays over the

last 10 years, highlighting Med. Services indifference to the seriousness of petitioner's medical need to have a properly functioning and fitting prosthesis without excessive delays. The N.J. District Court in *Taylor v. Plousis* 101 F.Supp2d 255 determined: "A medical need will be considered serious where delay in treatment results in the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain. Moreover, a medical condition which threatens a plaintiff's ability to walk, even on a non-permanent basis, falls within the ambit of a serious medical need." The same Court also stated: "Intentional delay in providing leg prosthesis would constitute deliberate indifference." *Taylor (supra)*.

While the DOC may argue they are not "intentionally" delaying the process, they cannot deny that they intentionally refuse to expedite the process to reduce delays. In fact in 2011 they added the step of the prosthetic provider having to examine the prosthesis and submit an estimate for approval before any work can be done. This step alone doubled the time that petitioner has to walk on a dysfunctional prosthesis

or no prosthesis at all. Appendix D39 - D39e is a 5 page IRS sent to the Dir Med. Services detailing the problems causing excessive delays in servicing his prosthesis and offering proactive solutions. The response was a polite "Thank you for your suggestions.", but nothing changed.

The N.J. District Court further determined in Taylor (supra) that: "Deliberate indifference exists where officials delay necessary treatment for non-medical reasons or where prison officials erect arbitrary and burdensome procedures that result in a significant delay in such treatment."

One of petitioner's suggestions to help expedite the process is to have DOC maintenance do minor or "preventative maintenance" on the prosthesis, as he has done all his adult life. The Med. Services response was an emphatic "no".

The DOC has shown a deliberate intent to maintain the current process involving excessive delays in servicing and returning petitioner's prosthesis. They are therefore deliberately indifferent to the pain and suffering the delays cause. The District

Court of the First Circuit finds such deliberate intent to violate the Eighth Amendment as stated in *Ferola v Moran* 622 F.Supp 814 : "The Eighth Amendment requires the government to provide medical care for prisoners, and deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners constitutes unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, forbidden by the Eighth Amendment. The critical factor is that the indifference be not merely inadvertent or negligent, but deliberate, for it is only such deliberate indifference that can offend evolving standards of decency in violation of the Eighth Amendment."

The First Circuit in *Kimian v N.H. DOC* 301 F.3d 13 expressed their opinion that disabled inmates rights against cruel and unusual punishment, as well as discrimination, are protected by Title II of the ADA: "Title II of the ADA protects the Constitutional Rights of the disabled and specifically the rights of disabled prison inmates against discrimination and against cruel and unusual punishment."

The District Court Second District (First Circuit) finds the DOC's haphazard treatment reaches the level of deliberate indifference



as stated in *Soneeya v Spencer* 851 F.Supp 2d 228: "Deliberate indifference may be found even in the absence of any sinister motive or purpose to do harm. Rather, a pattern of delays, poor explanations, missteps, changes in position and rigidities, may be used to infer deliberate indifference on the part of the DOC."

Therefore, in light of the foregoing, petitioner contends he has presented sufficient evidence of the Constitutional and Federal rights violated by the N.H. DOC. In *Hafer v Melo* 502 US 21 the U.S. Supreme Court determined: "In suit for damages brought under §1983 against state official in official capacity, for liability to be established, governmental entities' policies or customs must have played a part in violation of Federal law."

Petitioner contends the foregoing violations subject the DOC to both compensatory as well as punitive damages. The N.H. Supreme Court provides guidelines for compensatory damages in *Porter v City of Manchester* 151 NH 30: "The usual rule of compensatory damages



in tort cases requires that the person wronged receive a sum of money that will restore the person as nearly as possible to the position he or she would have been in if the wrong had not been committed."

Petitioner seeks compensatory damages for the lost wages he suffered in the 5 months he was deprived of his prosthesis during the summer of 2014. While petitioner lost his prosthesis April 15<sup>th</sup> it was assumed to be the usual 4-6 weeks before return of his prosthesis, so Mr Pellitier kept his job open. However, at the end of May he discovered the extensive delay due to the remanufacture of the lower half of the prosthesis would result in a delay until at least the end of the summer. So Mr Pellitier had to let petitioner go with the assurance he would be rehired upon receipt of his prosthesis. As such, Mr Pellitier paid him from April 15<sup>th</sup> until June 1<sup>st</sup>. At that point petitioner's pay went from \$3. per day, 6 days per week (\$18 per week) down to .85¢ per day, 5 days per week (\$4.25 per week). Petitioner resumed working in the kitchen October 1<sup>st</sup>.

Therefore, petitioner seeks compensatory

damages for 17 weeks of lost wages. The difference between the no job rate of \$4.25 per week and the kitchen rate of \$18. per week is \$13.75. That difference times 17 weeks comes to \$233.75. In addition, petitioner must work the first 7 months at \$2. per day before returning to the \$3 per day he was earning. As the N.H. Supreme Court determined compensatory damages need to "restore the person as nearly as possible to the position he or she would have been in...", petitioner asserts he is entitled to that \$1. per day, 6 days per week for the 30 weeks until he is back to his \$3. per day. This comes to \$180. Combining lost wages with lost future wages comes to \$413.75

In June 2014 petitioner sought these wages from the DOC when he wrote to Dir. Med Services Helen Hanks and Commissioner Wrenn explaining that the DOC was negligent, therefore at fault for the extensive delay resulting in the job loss. He explained that the DOC was negligent as they were informed by NEBCO in 2008 when they ignored recommendations and ordered an obsolete exoskeletal prosthesis with a knee unit being discontinued. See Appendix

D54-D54b and D55.

Following their "lowest cost" over patient health paradigm, the DOC once again ignored professional recommendations and ordered another obsolete exoskeletal prosthesis, but as the Mauch knee unit was long discontinued, they substituted a far inferior knee unit lacking the stability functions petitioner has relied on for 30 years. When petitioner went to the new prosthetics provider Capitol O & P and discovered that the endoskeletal recommendation had been rejected for an obsolete design he could not walk safely in, both petitioner and Capitol O & P agreed it was too unstable and rejected the design.

Petitioner instructed Capitol O & P to resubmit the endoskeletal design and inform petitioner if it was not approved so he could file an injunction. The DOC finally complied, but the second approval process and second manufacture process not only cost petitioner his job, but likely cost the DOC far more money than if they had simply complied with the professionals who had recommended the endoskeletal prosthesis back in 2008. A Mr Kench of the

Commissioner's Office refused to compensate petitioner for any lost wages.

Petitioner next seeks the restitution of \$63.15 for work shoes he was forced to purchase in 2013. As 2 doctors have instructed petitioner to wear alternative shoes to the ones DOC issues all non-disabled inmates, does not mean he has to purchase his own. Petitioner further requests this honorable Court issue a mandate that the DOC reimburse him for all future shoe purchases at the same frequency of replacement as they replace shoes issued to all other inmates.

Lastly, petitioner seeks punitive damages in the amount of \$20,000. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Smith v. Wade* 461 US 30 held that "punitive damages in an action under §1983 are available when a defendant's conduct is shown to be compelled by or when it involves callous indifference to the federally protected rights of others."

The N.H. Supreme Court similarly determined the availability of punitive damages in *Porter v. City of Manchester* 151 NH 30: "§1983, which is derived from the Civil Rights Act of 1871 "was intended to create a species of

tort liability in favor of persons<sup>¶</sup> deprived of federally secured rights" (Smith v Wade 461 US 30). It is well established that "a jury is permitted to access punitive damages in an action under § 1983 when the defendants' conduct involves reckless or callous indifference to the federally protected rights of others." It is likewise generally established that individual public officers are liable for punitive damages for their misconduct on the same basis as other individual defendants."

Petitioner intends to use the vast majority of the \$20,000. to purchase the manufacture of a second prosthesis. Additionally, he will have the socket of the current prosthesis replaced using newer and lighter materials than "lowest cost" provides for. The current socket was made in 2008. Only the lower half of the prosthesis was replaced in 2014. It is important that both sockets be identical and the only way to ensure that is manufacturing them at the same time.

Petitioner asserts that having two prostheses is the only way his civil rights will be guaranteed. The DOC has repeatedly

refused to modify any policy or procedure to expedite the servicing process, in fact they instituted cost saving policy which significantly lengthened the process. The DOC has repeatedly refused to purchase a second hydraulic unit and refuses to allow Maintenance Services to perform any servicing. The DOC has also refused petitioner's suggestion to have the prosthetics provider come into the facility.

As such the only alternative available to end the discriminatory deprivations of his prosthesis and the resultant pain and suffering, is to have two identical prostheses. When one needs servicing, petitioner wears the second, thus allowing the DOC the months required to service the dysfunctioning one.

Lastly, petitioner seeks reimbursement for costs in seeking justice for these civil rights violations. At this time petitioner seeks \$ TBD in photocopy costs. Further expenses of postage and additional photocopies are expected. Court costs of \$350.<sup>00</sup> for filing fee are expected. The percentage owed petitioner and remainder owed the Court, as well as legal fees, will be determined at judgement.

Therefore, in light of the foregoing evidence

of the pattern of civil and Constitutional Rights violations, petitioner respectfully requests this Honorable Court schedule this action for jury trial.

12/09/14

date

Respectfully submitted  
~~Kevin Hokenstrom~~

Kevin Hokenstrom

NCF 74448

138 East Milan Rd

Berlin, N.H. 03570



Dear Court Clerk;

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF N.H.  
FILED

12/09/14

2014 DEC 15 P 12:10

Please find enclosed my petition for  
NA USCS 1983 enclosed. As I don't know  
what I'm doing, I hope the petition is  
procedurally correct enough for filing.

In a separate mailing I am also  
sending you a Motion to Proceed In Forma  
Pauperis and Motion for Court Appointment of  
Counsel. According to the court rules, the  
court will assess the initial filing fee  
of 20% of the balance in the inmate account  
for the last 6 months. According to my  
calculator, this comes to \$37.99. Do I send  
a request to Inmate Accounts now, or do I  
wait for a decision on whether the Motion  
for 1983 is determined to be procedurally correct?

Thank you for any assistance you may  
provide.

Regards,  
Kevin Hokenstrom

Kevin Hokenstrom  
NCF 74448  
138 East Milan Rd  
Berlin, N.H. 03570